

WERE THE HANDSOME FAVORITES OF ELIZABETH HER LOVERS?

U. S. HISTORIAN ARISES TO DEFEND "VIRGIN QUEEN'S" MORALITY

POLITICAL ENEMIES TAXED HER FALSELY WITH LOVE AFFAIRS

Frederick Chamberlain Refutes Charges That Daughter of Henry VIII Was Guilty of Having Amorous Attachments With Eight Men Frequently Mentioned in History—They Gave Their Lives to Services of the State She Ruled.

By NAZARIENE DAAN KANNIBELLE.

WERE the handsome young favorites with whom Queen Elizabeth surrounded herself her lovers?

The world at large, studying the comments of historians, has an uneasy suspicion that her relations with them were as much influenced by personal as State considerations. But a defender of the Virgin Queen has now arisen in the person of Frederick Chamberlain, an American historian, who in the course of a comprehensive study of her character refutes the charges against her.

Mr. Chamberlain has sought for documents said by historians to be evidence against the Queen's chastity, and he has found some of them do not exist. On the other hand, he has obtained hitherto unpublished documents in her favor.

Of the men who were said to be her lovers.

Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester. Sir Christopher Hatton, afterward lord chancellor.

Duc d'Anjou, afterward Henry III of France.

William Cecil, Lord Burghley. Robert, second Earl of Essex.

Stimler, servant to Anjou. Sir Walter Raleigh.

Sir Charles Blount, afterward Earl of Devonshire.

The author considers the leading three—Leicester, Hatton and Essex—were men who deserved positions in the Queen's government. They all performed important service, and some of them great services to a sovereign who, while they were mere boys, saw what they were capable of doing for their country if only they had the opportunity.

That opportunity she supplied. In return they gave their entire lives to the service of the state and the nation. England has repaid them with obloquy, and, because of them, repaid Elizabeth with the vilest insinuations that can be made against a woman.

QUEEN OF SCOTS' LETTER.

Six of the known charges against the chastity of Elizabeth were made by the historian, John Lingard, who included as one of his authorities the famous scandal letter to the Queen from Mary Queen of Scots.

In two of the charges Lingard based his assertions on documents which he declared were in the library of Simancas in Spain. The first, he stated, showed that De Quadra, Spanish ambassador to the English court, informed King Philip of Spain, in the beginning of 1561, that, according to common belief, the queen lived with Dudley, and

that in one of his audiences Elizabeth spoke to him respecting this report, and in proof of its improbability showed him the situation of her room and bed chamber; but soon afterwards deprived herself of this defense by removing Dudley to a room contiguous to her own chamber on the pretext that his apartment in the lower story of the palace was unwholesome.

According to Mr. Chamberlain, there is no trace of this letter or any letter resembling it in the library at Simancas, and neither Froude nor Hume nor the editors of the Spanish reproduction of the Simancas documents found therein any such letter.

Lingard proceeds that:

"Dudley, though the most favored, was not considered as her only lover. Among his rivals were numbered Hatton and Raleigh, Oxford and Blount and Simler and Anjou, and it was afterwards believed that her licentious habits survived even when the fires of wantonness had been quenched by the chill of age. The court imitated the manners of the sovereign." In support of this Lingard refers to the famous letter from Mary Stuart, which he considers too plain spoken for him to quote.

"It can be no more immodest or immoral to get forth verbatim the letter relied on to prove her (Elizabeth's) lightness than to assert that document without printing it," comments Mr. Chamberlain. "Elizabeth has had to suffer for more than three centuries of such innuendo."

The letter from Mary to Elizabeth dated 1554 to 1556 is the recital of statements made by the Countess of Shrewsbury, in which, among others, the following occurred.

"Firstly, that one to whom she said had made a promise of marriage before a lady of your chamber had lain many times with you with all the licence and familiarity which husband and wife can use to one another. But that undoubtedly you were not as other women, and for this reason all those who desired your marriage with the Duke of Anjou, considering that it could not be consummated, were foolish, and that you would never wish to lose the liberty of making love and gratifying yourself with new lovers. . . . That you could

not content yourself with Master Hatton (Sir Christopher Hatton) and another of this kingdom. But that which vexed her most was that you not only compromised your honor with a foreigner named Simler, going to find him at night in the chamber of a lady . . . whom the said Countess greatly blamed in this affair, where you kissed him and indulged in divers unseemly familiarities with him.

DOESN'T ACCEPT LETTER.

"That you had disported yourself with the same dissoluteness with the Duke, his master, who had been to find you one night at the door of your chamber where you

had met him only your night-dress and dressing-gown on and that afterwards you had let him enter and that he remained with you nearly three hours. . . ."

Mr. Chamberlain, however, does not accept this as a proven letter of Mary Stuart. Even assuming that she was the author, he points out that she says "the greater part" of its charges "I did not at all believe, knowing the disposition of the Countess" (one of the worst of viragos and according to her own testimony a liar and a slanderer) and that the letter ends thus: "I swear to you once more on my faith and honor

that . . . what concerns your honor will never be known through me, holding it quite false."

Mr. Chamberlain continues: "Mary Stuart knew, if anybody knew, whether or not Elizabeth was immoral. So did her spies at Whitehall and all the other places. With proof in her hands Mary would almost surely have unseated Elizabeth. Every Catholic was for Mary. The great majority of the Protestants would not have supported the dissolute woman as their ruler. Had Mary Stuart believed in these or any other stories in the same effect she would have informed the Pope, Philip II, and the Catholic monarch of France. There is not, however, and never has been so far as anybody is able to determine, the slightest evidence that Mary ever did anything of the sort; and once again we repeat that Mary KNEW."

The final accusation of Lingard's in that the Queen had borne to Dudley a child, who took the name of Arthur Dudley and appeared in Madrid in 1586. The answer Mr. Chamberlain gives is to reproduce all the authentic information concerning the story of Arthur Dudley and to show that it is not of sufficient weight to be considered; for the young man, according to his own story admits that he was a thief from his benefactor, whom he supposed to be his own father, and that he was willing to sell his convictions, even to deny his religion before God Himself, for board and bed.

Of all charges, however, the Dyer-Hatton letter and the Hatton "love letters" are the most formidable to answer. Edward Dyer was a poet, a courtier, a close friend of Philip Sidney, while Sir Christopher Hatton, one of Elizabeth's fifty gentlemen-pensioners, was the future Lord Chancellor, selected by the Queen. It was reported, after she had seen him dance. In point of fact, the Queen had been observing Hatton in her service for twenty-three years before he was made Lord Chancellor.

MISINTERPRETED WORDS.

At the time of this letter Hatton was out of favor with Elizabeth, "and this as a result of an enemy's displacing him in her regard." So he consulted Dyer as to how to regain his prestige, and Dyer, in his reply, made use of the two following

sentences, which for generations have been considered evidence of Elizabeth's guilty relations with Hatton:

" . . . though she do descend very much in her sex as a woman . . ."

"For though in the beginning when her majesty sought you she did bear with rugged dealing of years, until she had what she fancied, yet now, after satiety and fulness, it will rather hurt than help you . . ."

Is there any innocent explanation of these words?

Mr. Chamberlain considers there is. "INVENTIONS."

So great was the rivalry to be received by her for one minute by the thousands of men who depended on her for success that the author does not consider any word in that letter as evidence that the struggle was for the position of the queen's lover.

The construction placed upon the other second sentence is merely "an example of euphemism so dear to the hearts of the English-speaking public. The almost invariable expression among us for illicit relations is 'what she wanted or what he wanted.'" In this letter it is said that Elizabeth bore with opposition from Hatton until "she had what she fancied." Similarly with the words, "satiety and fulness," which in Elizabeth's day did not mean sexual fatigue or disgust.

The real explanation of all the statements made against Elizabeth is contained, according to Mr. Chamberlain, in the words of the *Sieur de la Mauvissiere*, who first negotiated with the queen for the restoration of Calais and was connected with the English court for a quarter of a century. When he died, after having enjoyed close acquaintance with Elizabeth and all the men and women of her court, he left this message to his son:

"And if some persons have wished to tax her falsely with having amorous attachments, I shall say with truth that these are inventions forged by the malevolent, and from the cabinets of some ambassadors, to prevent those to whom it would have been most useful from making an alliance with her."

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

GOOD QUEEN BESS



that in one of his audiences Elizabeth spoke to him respecting this report, and in proof of its improbability showed him the situation of her room and bed chamber; but soon afterwards deprived herself of this defense by removing Dudley to a room contiguous to her own chamber on the pretext that his apartment in the lower story of the palace was unwholesome.

According to Mr. Chamberlain, there is no trace of this letter or any letter resembling it in the library at Simancas, and neither Froude nor Hume nor the editors of the Spanish reproduction of the Simancas documents found therein any such letter.

Lingard proceeds that:

"Dudley, though the most favored, was not considered as her only lover. Among his rivals were numbered Hatton and Raleigh, Oxford and Blount and Simler and Anjou, and it was afterwards believed that her licentious habits survived even when the fires of wantonness had been quenched by the chill of age. The court imitated the manners of the sovereign." In support of this Lingard refers to the famous letter from Mary Stuart, which he considers too plain spoken for him to quote.

"It can be no more immodest or immoral to get forth verbatim the letter relied on to prove her (Elizabeth's) lightness than to assert that document without printing it," comments Mr. Chamberlain. "Elizabeth has had to suffer for more than three centuries of such innuendo."

The letter from Mary to Elizabeth dated 1554 to 1556 is the recital of statements made by the Countess of Shrewsbury, in which, among others, the following occurred.

"Firstly, that one to whom she said had made a promise of marriage before a lady of your chamber had lain many times with you with all the licence and familiarity which husband and wife can use to one another. But that undoubtedly you were not as other women, and for this reason all those who desired your marriage with the Duke of Anjou, considering that it could not be consummated, were foolish, and that you would never wish to lose the liberty of making love and gratifying yourself with new lovers. . . . That you could

not content yourself with Master Hatton (Sir Christopher Hatton) and another of this kingdom. But that which vexed her most was that you not only compromised your honor with a foreigner named Simler, going to find him at night in the chamber of a lady . . . whom the said Countess greatly blamed in this affair, where you kissed him and indulged in divers unseemly familiarities with him.

DOESN'T ACCEPT LETTER.

"That you had disported yourself with the same dissoluteness with the Duke, his master, who had been to find you one night at the door of your chamber where you

had met him only your night-dress and dressing-gown on and that afterwards you had let him enter and that he remained with you nearly three hours. . . ."

Mr. Chamberlain, however, does not accept this as a proven letter of Mary Stuart. Even assuming that she was the author, he points out that she says "the greater part" of its charges "I did not at all believe, knowing the disposition of the Countess" (one of the worst of viragos and according to her own testimony a liar and a slanderer) and that the letter ends thus: "I swear to you once more on my faith and honor

that . . . what concerns your honor will never be known through me, holding it quite false."

Mr. Chamberlain continues: "Mary Stuart knew, if anybody knew, whether or not Elizabeth was immoral. So did her spies at Whitehall and all the other places. With proof in her hands Mary would almost surely have unseated Elizabeth. Every Catholic was for Mary. The great majority of the Protestants would not have supported the dissolute woman as their ruler. Had Mary Stuart believed in these or any other stories in the same effect she would have informed the Pope, Philip II, and the Catholic monarch of France. There is not, however, and never has been so far as anybody is able to determine, the slightest evidence that Mary ever did anything of the sort; and once again we repeat that Mary KNEW."

The final accusation of Lingard's in that the Queen had borne to Dudley a child, who took the name of Arthur Dudley and appeared in Madrid in 1586. The answer Mr. Chamberlain gives is to reproduce all the authentic information concerning the story of Arthur Dudley and to show that it is not of sufficient weight to be considered; for the young man, according to his own story admits that he was a thief from his benefactor, whom he supposed to be his own father, and that he was willing to sell his convictions, even to deny his religion before God Himself, for board and bed.

Of all charges, however, the Dyer-Hatton letter and the Hatton "love letters" are the most formidable to answer. Edward Dyer was a poet, a courtier, a close friend of Philip Sidney, while Sir Christopher Hatton, one of Elizabeth's fifty gentlemen-pensioners, was the future Lord Chancellor, selected by the Queen. It was reported, after she had seen him dance. In point of fact, the Queen had been observing Hatton in her service for twenty-three years before he was made Lord Chancellor.

MISINTERPRETED WORDS.

At the time of this letter Hatton was out of favor with Elizabeth, "and this as a result of an enemy's displacing him in her regard." So he consulted Dyer as to how to regain his prestige, and Dyer, in his reply, made use of the two following

sentences, which for generations have been considered evidence of Elizabeth's guilty relations with Hatton:

" . . . though she do descend very much in her sex as a woman . . ."

"For though in the beginning when her majesty sought you she did bear with rugged dealing of years, until she had what she fancied, yet now, after satiety and fulness, it will rather hurt than help you . . ."

Is there any innocent explanation of these words?

Mr. Chamberlain considers there is. "INVENTIONS."

So great was the rivalry to be received by her for one minute by the thousands of men who depended on her for success that the author does not consider any word in that letter as evidence that the struggle was for the position of the queen's lover.

The construction placed upon the other second sentence is merely "an example of euphemism so dear to the hearts of the English-speaking public. The almost invariable expression among us for illicit relations is 'what she wanted or what he wanted.'" In this letter it is said that Elizabeth bore with opposition from Hatton until "she had what she fancied." Similarly with the words, "satiety and fulness," which in Elizabeth's day did not mean sexual fatigue or disgust.

The real explanation of all the statements made against Elizabeth is contained, according to Mr. Chamberlain, in the words of the *Sieur de la Mauvissiere*, who first negotiated with the queen for the restoration of Calais and was connected with the English court for a quarter of a century. When he died, after having enjoyed close acquaintance with Elizabeth and all the men and women of her court, he left this message to his son:

"And if some persons have wished to tax her falsely with having amorous attachments, I shall say with truth that these are inventions forged by the malevolent, and from the cabinets of some ambassadors, to prevent those to whom it would have been most useful from making an alliance with her."

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

RIVALRY WAS GREAT AMONG COURTIER WHO SOUGHT FAVORS

Words of *Sieur de la Mauvissiere* Quoted to Show Accusations Were Forged by Malevolents and Some Ambassadors to Prevent Those to Whom It Would Have Been Most Useful From Making an Alliance With Her.

sentences, which for generations have been considered evidence of Elizabeth's guilty relations with Hatton:

" . . . though she do descend very much in her sex as a woman . . ."

"For though in the beginning when her majesty sought you she did bear with rugged dealing of years, until she had what she fancied, yet now, after satiety and fulness, it will rather hurt than help you . . ."

Is there any innocent explanation of these words?

Mr. Chamberlain considers there is. "INVENTIONS."

So great was the rivalry to be received by her for one minute by the thousands of men who depended on her for success that the author does not consider any word in that letter as evidence that the struggle was for the position of the queen's lover.

The construction placed upon the other second sentence is merely "an example of euphemism so dear to the hearts of the English-speaking public. The almost invariable expression among us for illicit relations is 'what she wanted or what he wanted.'" In this letter it is said that Elizabeth bore with opposition from Hatton until "she had what she fancied." Similarly with the words, "satiety and fulness," which in Elizabeth's day did not mean sexual fatigue or disgust.

The real explanation of all the statements made against Elizabeth is contained, according to Mr. Chamberlain, in the words of the *Sieur de la Mauvissiere*, who first negotiated with the queen for the restoration of Calais and was connected with the English court for a quarter of a century. When he died, after having enjoyed close acquaintance with Elizabeth and all the men and women of her court, he left this message to his son:

"And if some persons have wished to tax her falsely with having amorous attachments, I shall say with truth that these are inventions forged by the malevolent, and from the cabinets of some ambassadors, to prevent those to whom it would have been most useful from making an alliance with her."

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

Of the medical history of the queen, Mr. Chamberlain has a great deal to say. Having gathered together all the available evidence of the queen's continuous bad health, he has secured the opinions of eminent medical men upon her history.

Apart from her illnesses, small pox, chickenpox, gumbolls, pyorrhea, jaundice, and disease of the kidneys, she suffered from a septic condition of the mouth which resulted in her death.

Upon her leg, just above the ankle, was a sore which remained unhealed for eight years, and on her shoulder she had an "issue" which kept her from hunting. The opinion of Sir Arthur Keith is that there are no signs she inherited a complaint from her licentious father, Henry VIII. (From the *World-wide News Service*, Inc., Boston, Mass.)

MOSCOW, A CITY OF BUREAUCRATS AND BUGS, SAYS CAPT. LYNCH, WHO FOUND TARTARS EVERYWHERE READY TO USE BAYONET

ALL MUST HAVE THE PASSWORD

Former English Soldier Writes Graphic Story of the "Red Tape" Even in Getting a Hotel Room in the Big City.

By CAPT. ARTHUR LYNCH, (Former Member of British Parliament.)

This is the second in a series of articles on Russian internal conditions by Captain Arthur Lynch, former member of the British Parliament, who has just returned from a two months' visit in Russia.

(Copyright, 1921, By Universal Service)

LONDON, Dec. 10.—My first contact with Moscow was disconcerting, but it was only the little beginning of a whole series of mishaps which I will explain in detail, because they serve to throw a light on the dislocation of the social life of Russia.

I may have to anticipate from time to time, to render matters intelligible, so that I may say here at once what I learnt long afterwards, that a little committee had been appointed to receive distinguished guests, amongst whom they were good enough to include myself. This was excellent, as so many projects in Russia, for lack of some essential. The committee had been appointed, but no members were nominated, so that when I arrived in this great city there was no one to meet me at all.

I thought this a little awkward at the time, but I now see clearly that it was serious for, as I could not account for myself to the local functionaries, the only other resource would have been to send me to prison, pending inquiries.

On the way to Moscow, however, I had made the acquaintance of two functionaries of the Foreign Office, who were coming from Berlin to confer with the Soviet authorities. In the course of conversation, I discovered that they had lived within a stone's throw of my house in London and, as everyone is friendly in Russia, except those who are unfriendly, we had got on well during the journey. When they saw my plight, therefore, they returned and

asked me to accompany them to the Foreign Office, where they would endeavour to straighten out the difficulty.

This seemed to me a light affair, but then I knew nothing of Moscow. In the first place, although there seemed to be plenty of idle people about, it was difficult to get a porter; we found at least a few veritable Chinese, who seemed willing to work, and we engaged two of these: one young one, grinning, in an all-yellow suit; the other older and sombre, in complete black, buttoned up to the chin.

ONLY SOLDIERS ACTIVE.

The Russians stood looking round with curiosity; the only people who were active were soldiers, with medals, and functionaries who did not appear to be doing anything very definite except magnifying their office.

A young girl came up and begged bread, and when I gave it to her, she walked away with it, slowly, not eating it.

Outside the station we found a few drochki, looking like glorified hansom cabs with hoods on. Most of these had wretched-looking, small horses. Others had fine, big, black horses. A big dog, something like a mongrel St. Bernard, came bounding along, and I noticed that, though he was unkempt, he was certainly not starved. Then in a couple of drochki we drove in state to the foreign office.

A long stretch of streets lay between the railway station and the government offices. The first sight of these was extraordinary. The great city seemed almost deserted. The shops were closed, and where windows were left unshuttered they were broken. We passed along cobbled streets, unswayed and filled with variegated odors, none of them could be named. Great churches of all kinds began to appear, some magnificent in their gilded splendor, while again from time to time little familiar churches, like toys, very small, painted and gilt and tricked out with gaudy ikons. The streets were deserted, except for a few furtive passers-by, and what had once been big hotels were closed and dilapidated.

The impression of contrast and incongruity which I was destined to meet with all through Russia, was already visible here. Some splendid buildings that suggested Whitehall in London were mixed with tumble-down shanties such as I have seen in a derelict village in Ireland.

Soldiers became more and more frequent as our drochki moved on. The uniforms were certainly a

little more uniform than I noticed on our entry into Russia, but there was no attempt to imitate the spick-and-span appearance of an English "Tom